DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 647 HE 009 801

TITLE	Project WELD. Women's Education: Learning and Doing. A Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Formative Evaluation Research Associates, Ann Arbor, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
NOTE	69p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Coeducation; *Educational Alternatives; *Internship Programs; Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; *Skill Development; Surveys; *Womens Education; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Cedar Crest College PA; Everywomens Center (University of Massachusetts); Mount Holyoke College MA; Mount Vernon College DC; *Single Sex Colleges; Wellesley College MA; Wells College NY; Westbrook Junior College ME; Womens Center (University of Minnesota)

ABSTRACT

A project was undertaken to provide information about three types of education options available to undergraduate women: internships, women's studies classes, and skills development classes or workshops. Eight schools participated in the study: Wellesley College, Mt. Holyoke College, Cedar Crest College, Wells College, Westbrook College, Mt. Vernon College, Everywomen's Center at the University of Massachusetts, and the Women's Center at the University of Minnesota. A number of questions were addressed by the study: Why did students choose these experiences?; What did the various programs offer to students?; What are the differences between single-sex colleges and coed universities?; What is the impact of the programs?; Were students satisfied, and what improvements would they offer?; Did these experiences relate to students' future roles?; and did these students feel their institutions could be improved as schools for women? (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154647

PROJECT WELD

WOMEN'S EDUCATION: LEARNING AND DOING

A FINAL REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FUNDED BY

THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT

OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M A Talbert
F.E.R.A
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

NE 009 801

FERA

FORMATIVE EVALUATION RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
JUNE, 1977

PREFACE

Each year the Fund receives a large number of applications for programs aimed at improving women's educational opportunities, and each year some are funded. Our decisions, while always difficult to arrive at, are at best based on good common sense, strong hunches and information gained from the few studies which presently exist or are currently underway. It seemed to us that what was lacking was information about the value of the various typical women's educational programs -- internships, women's studies, and skills development. It was because of this that the FERA study interested us. While we knew that a small study of this nature could not profess to be comprehensive or conclusive, it appealed to us because of its interactive nature. The reviewers would assess quickly the three program components at a small number of institutions, and report back to the institutions, the general public, and the Fund about the relative success of programs. Because of this feature, we funded the study.

The study shows that these three programs do accomplish their goals. Women's studies programs promote feminist perspectives; internships foster professional potential, and skills classes develop assertiveness and communication skills. But what may even be more important is that they also foster, and more successfully than does traditional education, the development of self-confidence, a greater sense of personal potential, independence, and self-assertiveness; these are all highly significant qualities for women today.

One must ask then, if these programs are so effective, how can traditional education be redesigned or amplified so that women's needs can be fully served? The report suggests that traditional liberal arts can be combined with career emphases which make possible an education which is in line with what students expect and want. Since women students find women's studies to be of such great value, how can its image be improved among traditional faculty? Why should women's studies be in such a particularly precarious position today when women recognize it as being so beneficial to their education? And finally, if as the report states, women students see themselves as combining career and family roles, what changes should society and particularly educational institutions undergo to make such combinations more feasible and easier?

The Advisory Board joins us in thanking Peg Talburtt and her associates for their excellent work. It is an important contribution to the task of reshaping education to meet the needs of modern women.

Virginia B. Smith
Carol F. Stoel
Fund for the Improvement of
Post-Secondary Education
Washington, D.C.

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

This project was undertaken to provide information about three types of educational options available to undergraduate women: internships, women's studies classes, and skills development classes (or workshops). An internship was defined as a college-sponsored program which had a stated goal of career exposure in an out-of-classroom setting, such as a summer job with a federal agency. A women's studies experience was defined as an academic course which focused on women's contributions or relationships to a particular field, such as feminist politics or women in history. Courses included in this group were not necessarily part of a formal women's studies program. The third category, skills development, signified a class or workshop which held the stated goal of behavioral change. Included were assertiveness training classes, career planning seminars, and personal growth classes. While these three program types did not exhaust the many options that have recently been designed to foster undergraduates' self-awareness, personal growth, and professional potential, these programs represented some of the more pervasive and successful of the recent innovations. The goal of this study was to evaluate the outcomes of these programs.

METHODOLOGY

Within this framework, eight schools were chosen for participation in this study. Six of the eight schools were predominantly women's colleges. The other two were women's centers at large coeducational universities. The rationale behind this choice was to initiate an assessment of women's educational progress in settings which had committed themselves almost exclusively to the full development of women students. The eight schools represent a variety of institutions for women and formed a broad sample from which conclusions about women's education could be drawn. The participating schools or programs were: Cedar Crest College, Everywoman's Center at the University of Massachusetts, Mount Holyoke College, Mount Vernon College, Wellesley College, Wells College, Westbrook College, and the Women's Center at the University of Minnesota.

The study began with preliminary visits to the programs at each school during the fall of 1975. Of the eight schools, six had internships, seven had women's studies courses, and three had skills classes. A total of 270 students, 50 faculty and administrators, and 25 clients (or intern employers) were personally interviewed during the winter of 1976, using questionnaires

designed for this study. Students were randomly selected from lists of those who had completed their involvement with the program approximately one year prior to their interview. The majority of students were 19-23 years of age; fewer than twenty of the women were 30 years of age or older.

Information was analyzed during the summer of 1976 and two reports were sent to each program to contribute to their program improvement. In this way, some measure of formative evaluation was possible. The major cross-school report was completed during the winter of 1977.

In addition, an advisory board was formed to review project progress, stimulate questions for analysis, and suggest applications of the project's findings. Members were Dr. Elizabeth Tidball of George Washington University, Dr. Sherry Penney of Yale University, Dr. Mariam Chamberlain of the Ford Foundation, and Ms. Carol Stoel of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. Their ideas, as well as those identified by the program directors and the FERA staff, led to analysis of numerous points. A summary is given for each point.

Why Did Students Choose These Experiences?

Students chose these various experiences to gain the general outcomes promised by each. Sixty-nine percent of the interns (N=128) sought career exposure, while 66% of the women's studies students (N=82) desired new academic perspectives about women. Forty-four percent of the students in skills classes (N=55) wanted new skills, such as assertiveness or communication skills, but another 40% mentioned new ideas or new attitudes as additional expectations.

What Did These Various Programs Offer To Students?

Students reported that the three types of programs achieved the goals that they promised. Internships promoted professional skills and career exposures. Women's studies classes fostered feminist perspectives and expanded concepts about what women can achieve. Skills classes led to increased self-understanding, assertiveness, and other skills related to personal effectiveness.

In addition, quantitative student data gathered with standardized forms indicated that these various options achieved other important results which were <u>not</u> expected, but were <u>highly</u> valued by students. Further, their programs accomplished most of these outcomes significantly better than the traditional (or general) curriculum at each school. For example, internships did more than provide career exposures. They increased self-confidence, openness, and assertiveness. Women's studies fostered self-confidence and a greater sense of personal potential. Skills classes affected self-confidence, independence, and feminist

perspectives, as well as interpersonal skills. In sum, each type of program accomplished different results, and all programs resulted in some outcomes that traditional educational experiences did not produce. Innovative structures have impact on outcomes that students rate as important -- they do make a difference, supplementing the traditional experience in some important ways.

What Are The Differences Between Single-Sex Colleges And Coed Universities?

Because this study did not include a representative or large sample of the varieties of especially coeducational schools, no firm conclusions can be drawn about differences between school types. However, it would appear that special programs for women enhance the quality of education that a female undergraduate at a coeducational university receives, and may be even more important to her full development than similar programs at a women's college. Much more research needs to be conducted before such an inference can be accepted.

What Is The Impact Of These Programs?

All three types of programs had impact on undergraduates; substantially more impact than other educational experiences. Eighty-four percent of the interns and 85% of the students in skills classes said these experiences had "some" to "lots more" impact on them than their other courses and academic activities, whereas only 72% of the students in women's studies offered such ratings. Seemingly, the unique instructional processes and/or setting of the former explains the differential scoring. Nonetheless, the power of all three programs was obvious.

Were Students Satisfied With Their Experiences And What Improvements Would They Offer?

Satisfaction with the process of the experience and with personal development was highest in the internships and skills classes, while satisfaction with academic content was slightly higher in the women's studies classes. Although this is not the way it has to be, it seemed that traditional instructional modes convey content better than innovative processes, while the nontraditional approaches seem to promote greater personal growth.

Despite the high satisfaction ratings, students did offer suggestions for improvement. In each type of experience, more highly organized structure was the most frequently mentioned desired improvement. More academic content was the most frequently mentioned addition. There was some evidence that students may not know how to evaluate innovative educational experiences because they do not know exactly what to expect from them. Indeed, more than 75% of each group of students replied that positive unexpected outcomes had occurred in their respective programs.

Did These Experiences Relate To Students' Future Roles?

Yes! Although a total of eight types of roles were mentioned, the major roles that students expected to assume were family and career. The most important skills they felt that they would need to be successful in those roles were self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and technical/professional skills. Clearly, these are the types of skills and attitudes that the three innovative educational experiences fostered. Within the groups, the interns were the most career oriented and the women's studies students the least family oriented. But to pretend that young women today do not seek family as well as career roles would be an erroneous assumption.

Did These Students Feel Their Institutions Could Be Improved As Schools For Women?

Again, yes! Seventy-six percent of the women at single-sex schools and 57% of the women at coeducational universities felt that their colleges could be improved as schools for women. Academics, support services, and structural improvements were suggested as foci for change.

CONCLUSION

This abstract contains many highlights of the full report Specifically, useful data from the faculty interviews, as well as more extensive student information, are missing from this summary. However, the implications of these findings are many and should be of interest to the students, faculty, program directors, and sponsors of programs for women.* Clearly, each of these programs makes an important and unique contribution to the education of women; one that is not available in traditional higher educational settings.

---

*All of these groups should recognize the specific benefits of each type of program and relate these to their educational purposes in an integrated way.

CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Context..... 1

Research Issues..... 3

Research Methodology..... 3

Research Findings..... 7

Conclusions and Implications..... 32

Selected Bibliography..... 35

Appendix..... 36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Typology for Sample Selection..... 2

Table 2: Project Timetable..... 5

Table 3: Program Identification by School..... 6

Table 4: Attributes Evaluated..... 8

Table 5: Opportunity to Develop Attributes..... 9

Table 6: Quality Ratings for All Programs..... 11

Table 7: Three Items Ranked Most Highly on Quality..... 12

Table 8: A Comparison Between the Quality of the Program and the Traditional Curriculum..... 13

Table 9: Importance of Attributes of Program Type..... 15

Table 10: Importance of Attributes by Institution Type.... 16

Table 11: Quality Ratings of Educational Experiences..... 17

Table 12: Level of Impact..... 18

Table 13: Impact Compared to Other Educational Experiences..... 19

Table 14: Satisfaction Ratings..... 21

Table 15: Comparison of Students' Initial Expectations with Program Realities..... 22

Table 16: Suggested Improvements..... 23

Table 17: Peer Approval..... 25

Table 18: Most Frequently Mentioned Roles..... 26

Table 19: Most Frequently Mentioned Skills..... 26

Table 20: Feelings of Discrimination by Program Type..... 28

Table 21: Feelings of Discrimination by Institution Type.. 28

Table 22: Improvements as a School for Women by Program Type..... 29

Table 23: Improvements as a School for Women by Institution Type..... 30

Table 24: Opportunities to Develop Attributes..... 31

INTRODUCTION

This report serves multiple needs. It confirms that Project WELD (Women's Education: Learning and Doing) was carried out as contracted by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. It presents the most important of the research findings, in nontechnical language that can be understood by many audiences. Potential audiences include program directors, financial sponsors, and undergraduate women who may seek one of the three types of educational programs discussed in this report. Lastly, the report seeks to inform these audiences as well as the general public about the strengths and weaknesses of the three types of programs for women, i.e., internships, women's studies, and skills classes.

Evaluation can do more than illuminate issues. It can affect the choices made by educators and students, male and female alike. Emphasis on utilization of findings is one of the chief ways that formative evaluation differs from basic evaluation or research. Methodological differences between formative and basic evaluation are highlighted in the text of the report.

This report discusses the context, methodology, findings, conclusions and implications of Project WELD. Before these discussions, however, it is important to acknowledge those who made this project a reality. Eight institutions and their students and faculty participated and were exceptionally cooperative: Cedar Crest, Mount Holyoke, Mount Vernon, University of Massachusetts, University of Minnesota, Wellesley, Wells, and Westbrook. Without their time, opinions, and support this project would not have been possible. In addition, credit must be given to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. Their belief that women's education deserves evaluation made this project feasible.

CONTEXT

The advent of the current women's movement has forced new assessment of the educational programs for women. In response to the demands that post-secondary education equip women to participate fully in all aspects of this nation's economic, political, and social systems, many institutions of higher education have designed and incorporated new curricula, services, and more diverse educational programs into their institutions, reflecting the needs of the contemporary female undergraduate.

This project focused on three types of educational programs for women: internships, women's studies, and skills classes. An internship was defined as a program which had a stated goal of career exposure in an out-of-classroom setting. Examples are: working for a congressperson for a summer in Washington, D.C., spending one month working as a veterinarian's assistant

and participating for a semester in a management seminar while simultaneously working in business. A women's studies experience was defined as an academic course which focused on women's contributions or relationships to a particular field, such as feminist politics or women in history. Courses included in this group were not necessarily part of a formal women's studies program. The third category, skills development, signified a class or workshop that had a stated goal of behavioral impact. Included were assertiveness training classes, career planning seminars, and personal growth classes. While these three program types do not exhaust the many options that have recently been designed to foster undergraduates' self-awareness and professional growth, these programs represent some of the more prominent recent innovations. Consequently, they were institutionalized and ready for evaluation.

Within this framework, eight schools were chosen for participation in the study. Six of the eight schools were colleges for women.* The other two were women's centers at large coeducational universities. The rationale behind this choice was to study women's education in as clear a way as possible. Each of these eight settings was explicitly dedicated to the full development of female students, as indicated by its public literature. It was felt that an assessment of women's educational progress should begin with those institutions that had committed themselves most directly to that goal. Table 1 details the framework for selection. The eight schools represent four types of women's schools and form a broad sample from which generalizations about women's education can be drawn.

Table 1

TYPOLOGY FOR SAMPLE SELECTION

Structure	Large	Small
Four Year	Wellesley Mount Holyoke	Cedar Crest Wells
Complex/ Transitional**	Everywoman's Center (Univ. Mass.) Women's Center (Univ. Minn.)	Westbrook Mount Vernon

**Denotes varying degree structure, including Associate Arts, Bachelor of Arts, advanced degrees, and no degree.

*or predominantly single sex; enrolling very few men.

These particular schools were selected because the quality of their programs for women was nationally known and accepted. Many other schools could have been included in this study. However, the exploratory nature of this project justified conscious, rather than random, selection of the institutions. Rather than survey the full spectrum of programs for women, this study focuses on three of the most prevalent program options at four types of institutions which were significantly committed to women's education. The summary purpose of this research is to understand if, and to what extent, these programs have impact on the women who experience them. Future researchers may wish to expand the sample, pursue these initial findings, and refine the measurement of many of the concepts underlying this study.

RESEARCH ISSUES

As previously stated, this study was an exploratory one. There were no preconceived hypotheses to test. The initial assumption was that each of the programs had merit. Therefore, research attempted to understand questions such as:

1. What are the outcomes of these programs? What is their impact on students?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each program?
3. Does it take a special educational experience (such as an internship or women's studies class) to foster behavior such as risk taking, creativity, etc., in women?
4. Does women's education relate to the roles and skills that undergraduates expect to assume in the future?

In addition to these issues, this study also serves two other goals. First, there was a priority to return the information to the schools who participated so that they could use the findings to improve or document their programs' effects. Second, there was emphasis on the sharing of this information with the larger educational community. It is possible that many foundations, students, program directors, and faculty are interested in the results of this study. Efforts have been made to circulate the findings to these audiences.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This report was written with a variety of audiences in mind. Enough of the research methodology will be explained to build confidence in and understanding of the data. Too much

methodological detail would prove both confusing and boring. If more information is desired, readers are encouraged to contact FERA directly.

The approach underlying the entire project was one of formative evaluation. This involved an interactive process between client and evaluator. Project WELD necessitated a slightly different approach because these schools had not come to FERA for evaluation. Instead, FERA went to them to ask their cooperation and participation in this project. This resulted in an evaluation philosophy and methodology that considered some individual program or institutional issues, but placed more emphasis on the analysis of the larger questions facing women's education.

Specifically, four groups had influence on the design of this study. FERA initially conceived of the format and methodology by drawing on its collective evaluation experience. The project director's doctoral research on risk taking and women undergraduates was a second reference point for this study. A third source of influence came from the various program directors and faculty at the eight schools who were interviewed to gather their concerns and needs before the research design was finalized. This helped FERA to incorporate into the design at least some of the desires of each program director as well as to confirm the study's goals and format with them.

In addition, a national advisory panel was formed. This panel included FIPSE representatives and Dr. Elizabeth Tidball, Dr. Sherry Penney, and Dr. Mariam Chamberlain, all well-known for their individual interests in women's education. Together they served as contributors to the research design, a sounding board for research findings, and a dissemination network.

The complete framework of the research is presented in table 2 (on page 5). The timetable and major activities of the study are noted.

The series of communications with the individual programs may be the factor that most distinguishes this project from traditional research. Immediately after the data collection, each school received a brief report on the strengths and weaknesses of its programs. Later, each school was sent a full report along with a feedback form, soliciting reactions to the report and requests for further information. Finally, all schools received a copy of the cross-school report, permitting them a reference point with which to compare their program's outcomes. In this way, some measure of formative feedback was offered to each college.

In total, more than 270 students*, 50 faculty and administrators, and 25 intern supervisors (or "real world" clients

---

*The majority were 18-22 years old; fewer than 20 were over 30 years old. The majority were white and middle-class.

Table 2

PROJECT TIMETABLE

Summer 1975	Fall 1975	Winter 1976	Fall 1976	Winter/Spring 1977
Grant procurred	Basic research design formulated Each school visited for negotiation to participate in the study Advisory panel meets Instruments finalized	Each school visited for data collection Brief post-visit report sent to each school Advisory panel meets	Detailed report sent to each school Cross-school report begun Public presentation of findings begun	Final report disseminated Advisory panel meets Final feedback session with each school

who employed the interns) were individually interviewed. Generally, students had completed the internship or class one year prior to their interview, although some were more or less recently involved than that. Interviews took approximately one hour, and included written assessments as well as open-ended questions. Copies of the interview forms are included in the Appendix.

Of the eight schools involved, six had internship programs, seven had women's studies courses, and three had skills classes as table 3 documents.

Table 3

PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION BY SCHOOL

Institution	Internships	Women's Studies	Skills Classes
Cedar Crest	X	X	
Everywoman's Center (Univ. Mass.)		X	X
Mount Holyoke	X	X	
Mount Vernon	X	X	
Wellesley	X		
Wells	X	X	X
Westbrook	X	X	
Women's Center (Univ. Minn.)		X	X

Several caveats to this research need discussion. The research was heavily based on student self-reports and opinions about intangible items such as program impact and satisfaction. In addition, only students who had completed a program were included in a sample, which was otherwise randomly selected. These points could suggest that student assessments lacked a critical perspective and hard data base. To some extent, this criticism is deserved. However, the strengths of this approach argued for its usage. One of the best ways to understand program usefulness is to ask students if the program was useful. To maintain methodological consistency, interviews were systematic, pretested, and obtained quantitative as well as qualitative information. The inclusion of four types of schools provided a broad perspective on program utility, viewing it in the larger context of women's

education. Although there were many differences between the schools and their programs, the similarities in program types argued for comparison.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This report presents specific findings about some educational options available to undergraduate women. Student, faculty, and where relevant, client opinions are analyzed. This information includes the most significant conclusions from the project but does not encompass all data collected. Inquiries about additional information are welcome and should be addressed to FERA. The following points were felt to be the most relevant to decision-makers, students, and others who are concerned with education for the modern woman.

Why Do Students Choose These Experiences?

Generally, students logically chose the experience that best served their needs. Sixty-nine percent of the interns' responses reflected involvement in that type of program to gain career exposure, while 66% of the responses from women's studies students said their choice of such a class evolved from the desire to obtain new ideas, particularly new academic material about women. As one might expect, the responses from 42% of the skills students indicated that they enrolled in that type of program to develop new skills, although the opportunities to develop new ideas and new attitudes also were mentioned by 20% and 22% of the students, respectively. Indeed, the main reason for students' choosing each type of experience was quite logical and flowed from the general expectations that each program conveyed.

What Do These Various Programs Really Offer to Students?

Stated simply, the three types of programs achieve the goals that they promise. Internships promote professional skills and career exposures. Women's studies foster feminist perspectives and expand concepts about what women can achieve. Skills classes or workshops lead to increased self-understanding and personal development. These conclusions are supported by the following data.

Students and faculty were given a list of skills to rate in three ways (see table 4). First, they indicated if the single program (internship, women's studies class, or skills class) provided the <u>opportunity</u> to develop each attribute (table 5),

Table 4

ATTRIBUTES EVALUATED

Assertiveness skills	Professional/technical skills
Communication skills	Sense of women's historical past
Decision-making skills	Sense of women's present
Discrimination-coping skills	Your creativity
Feminist perspective	Your independence
Leadership skills	Your openness to new experiences
New career goals	Your personal potential
Personal role models	Your professional potential
Professional female role models	Your risk-taking
Professional male role models	Your self-confidence

The above attributes were evaluated along the following three dimensions:

1. Opportunity to develop this attribute: ___ Yes ___ No

2. Quality of this student experience:
   5 = Excellent quality
   4 = Very good quality
   3 = Good quality
   2 = Fair quality
   1 = Poor quality

3. Importance of developing this attribute:
   5 = Extremely important
   4 = Rather important
   3 = Somewhat important
   2 = Of little importance
   1 = Of no importance

Table 5

OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP ATTRIBUTES

Percentage of Students Responding "Yes"

Attributes	Internships (n = 120)	Women's Studies (n = 80)	Skills Classes (n = 51)	Statistical Significance
Sense of women's historical past	19%	92%	48%	*
Sense of women's present	87	99	96	*
Feminist perspective	61	89	92	*
Professional female role models	87	86	86	
Professional male role models	76	38	30	*
Personal role models	83	81	88	
New career goals	85	61	72	*
Assertiveness skills	87	78	98	*
Leadership skills	75	65	74	
Communication skills	91	76	90	*
Decision-making skills	81	64	84	*
Professional/technical skills	87	39	47	*
Discrimination coping skills	56	78	80	*
Your self-confidence	91	89	96	
Your independence	89	77	90	*
Your risk-taking	65	67	84	*
Your openness to new experiences	94	85	88	
Your creativity	77	65	76	
Your personal potential	88	85	96	
Your professional potential	90	67	88	*

* Statistically significant $< .05$ (Chi-Square Statistic). When the responses from each of the three programs are compared to each other, a difference appears which can be attributable to some factor other than chance (at the .05 level--Chi-Square Statistic).

and then they evaluated the quality of program attributes (table 5). They also evaluated the traditional curriculum in a like manner.* Finally, the importance of each attribute to students was also scored (see table 9 on page 15).

...program structure has impact on educational outcomes....

Clearly, the various programs accomplish some very different kinds of results. Based on responses of yes or no, table 5 indicates whether each program provided the opportunity to develop these attributes. It shows that internships have particular impact on items such as professional/technical skills, male professional role models, and professional potential. Women's studies classes seem to provide the best opportunities to develop concepts about feminism and women's potential. The skills classes consistently affect personal qualities, such as risk taking, personal potential and assertiveness. All three programs facilitate self-confidence and openness. Indeed, different programmatic structures lead to different outcomes.

Quality scores reflect some differences between the programs. Table 6 compares the quality of the items in the traditional program with the quality in each of these special programs. Table 7 indicates the items that received the three highest quality ratings in each program. In other words, the attributes in table 7 are the outcomes which each program best achieves.

Several points are clear. First, each type of program transfers the qualities it was established to provide, e.g., internships foster professional potential, women's studies promote feminist perspectives, and skills classes develop assertiveness and communication skills. However, a second finding may be even more important. Each type of program accomplishes some ends that were not specifically promised to the students. For example, internships do more than provide career exposures. Increased self-confidence, openness, and assertiveness are predictable results. Women's studies foster self-confidence and a greater sense of personal potential. Skills classes affect self-confidence, independence, and feminist perspectives, as well as interpersonal skills. These "extra benefits" are found in all three programs. If students' reports are assumed to be accurate, it would appear that all three programs could alert future students to expect more specific outcomes than have previously been known. In so doing, more students may be attracted to these options because the types of outcomes have increased.

When compared to the traditional curricula at each school, the unique and important contributions of these program types become even more obvious. As table 8 indicates, each type of

*Traditional curriculum was defined as the overall or general experience at each school.

Table 6

QUALITY RATINGS FOR ALL PROGRAMS

Attributes	Internships (n=120)		Women's Studies (n=80)		Skills Classes (n=51)	
	Traditional	Program	Traditional	Program	Traditional	Program
Sense of women's historical past	3.48	3.36	2.85	3.85	2.87	3.08
Sense of women's present	3.91	3.82	3.20	4.04	3.16	3.98
Feminist perspective	3.44	3.53	2.82	3.83	3.17	3.73
Professional female role models	3.89	3.98	3.20	3.72	3.11	3.95
Professional male role models	3.36	3.58	3.31	3.21	3.03	3.00
Personal role models	3.70	3.91	3.50	3.57	2.97	4.05
New career goals	3.83	4.14	3.65	3.56	3.14	3.52
Assertiveness skills	3.68	3.97	3.46	3.32	3.27	3.92
Leadership skills	3.71	3.67	3.24	3.16	3.07	3.63
Communication skills	4.00	3.85	3.57	3.40	3.42	3.91
Decision-making skills	3.64	3.71	3.53	3.14	3.39	3.82
Professional/technical skills	3.48	3.52	3.68	3.20	3.35	3.70
Discrimination coping skills	3.30	3.73	3.08	3.46	3.25	3.50
Your self-confidence	3.66	4.04	3.55	3.69	3.24	4.08
Your independence	3.84	4.13	3.53	3.79	3.48	4.07
Your risk-taking	3.44	3.68	3.18	3.30	2.78	3.76
Your openness to new experiences	3.81	4.21	3.74	3.84	3.46	4.02
Your creativity	3.46	3.42	3.53	3.31	3.27	3.49
Your personal potential	3.93	4.04	3.76	3.65	3.58	4.00
Your professional potential	3.70	4.01	3.76	3.62	3.52	3.68

Note: All figures are means.

Quality Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 3 = Good 2 = Fair 1 = Poor

Table 7

THREE ITEMS RANKED MOST HIGHLY ON QUALITY

Internships (n=128)		Women's Studies (n=83)		Skills Classes (n=55)	
Rank	Item	Rank	Item	Rank	Item
1	Openness to new experiences	1	Sense of women's present	1	Assertiveness
2	New career goals	2	Sense of women's historical past	1	Sense of women's present
2	Independence	2	Feminist perspectives	1	Self-confidence
3	Self-confidence	2	Independence	1	Personal potential
3	Assertiveness	2	Openness to new experiences	1	Openness to new experiences
3	Personal potential	3	Self-confidence	2	Communications skills
3	Professional potential	3	Professional female role models	2	Independence
				3	Personal role models

Table 8

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM AND THE TRADITIONAL CURRICULUM

Attribute	Internships (n=120)	Women's Studies (n=80)	Skills Classes (n=51)
Sense of women's historical past		X	
Sense of women's present		X	X
Feminist perspective		X	X
Professional female role models		X	X
Professional male role models			
Personal role models	X		X
New career goals	X		X
Assertiveness skills	X		X
Leadership skills			X
Communication skills			X
Decision-making skills			X
Professional/technical skills			
Discrimination coping skills	X		
Your self-confidence	X		X
Your independence	X		X
Your risk-taking			X
Your openness to new experiences	X		X
Your creativity			X
Your personal potential			X
Your professional potential	X		

NOTE: $X < .05$ for quality of program being higher than quality of traditional (Pairwise T-Statistic). For none of these attributes was the traditional curriculum rated significantly higher than the program.

program develops many attributes significantly better than the traditional curriculum. Further, the three types of programs accomplish different objectives. Women's studies would appear to be the most direct route to fostering feminist consciousness about women's past and present. An internship encourages the development of professional potential and antidiscrimination skills better than either the other two program types or the traditional curriculum. Yet, with the exceptions of a sense of women's historical past and the professional qualities, the skills experience seems to promote every other attribute better than the traditional college experience.

> ...in no case did the traditional program develop important qualities in a significantly better way....

It is important to note that all of these attributes were rated by students as "rather important" to them. Table 9 presents the mean scores of importance as well as the rank-order for all items in the Experience Inventory. Clearly, these skills and attitudes are very much desired by these young women. Each type of program develops some of these qualities in ways that the traditional curriculum does not, although traditional classes generally were not established to promote any of these attributes. However, if a school sincerely wants to help female undergraduates attain their full potential, new programs such as these should be considered as necessary supplements to the usual academic experience. Truly, an internship, a women's studies class, and a skills class add new and desirable dimensions to women's education.

What Are the Differences Between Single-Sex Colleges and Coed Universities?

Although statistical comparisons between the two types of schools are impossible, several generalizations are feasible.* Table 10 notes that all women seem to feel that most items are equally important. Table 11 distinguishes the mean quality scores of all program types in the two settings and finds that they are very similar. Students in both settings rate the special programs at least slightly higher than their traditional

---

*Internships at coed universities were not included in this sample; therefore, the contributions of that type of program are not reflected in these coed students. Further, only women's centers at large public universities were considered. Other types of coeducational experiences, such as small private coeducational colleges, are not available for comparison because they were not included in this study.

Table 9

IMPORTANCE OF ATTRIBUTES BY PROGRAM TYPE

Attribute	Internships (n=120)		Women's Studies (n=80)		Skills Classes (n=51)	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Self-confidence	4.8	1	4.9	1	4.8	2
Personal potential	4.8	1	4.7	2	4.9	1
Communication skills	4.7	3	4.7	2	4.8	2
Independence	4.7	3	4.7	2	4.8	2
Decision-making skills	4.7	3	4.7	2	4.7	5
Openness to new experiences	4.7	3	4.5	7	4.6	6
Professional potential	4.7	3	4.5	7	4.5	7
Assertiveness skills	4.6	8	4.5	7	4.5	7
Sense of women's present	4.4	11	4.6	6	4.5	7
Leadership skills	4.5	9	4.3	11	4.0	16
Professional/technical skills	4.5	9	4.3	11	4.2	12
Creativity	4.4	11	4.4	10	4.4	10
New career goals	4.4	11	4.1	14	4.0	16
Discrimination coping skills	4.2	14	4.2	13	4.2	12
Personal role models	4.2	14	4.1	14	4.3	11
Risk-taking	4.2	14	4.0	16	4.2	12
Professional female role models	4.2	14	4.0	16	4.1	15
Feminist perspective	3.6	18	3.9	18	3.4	19
Professional male role models	3.4	19	3.2	20	3.0	20
Sense of women's historical past	3.2	20	3.8	19	3.6	18

Importance Scale: 5 = Extremely important
4 = Rather important
3 = Somewhat important
2 = Of little importance
1 = Of no importance

Table 10

IMPORTANCE OF ATTRIBUTES BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Coeducational Institutions vs. Women's Schools

Attributes	Coed Institution (n=68)		Women's Schools (n=194)	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Self-confidence	4.8	1	4.8	1
Communication skills	4.7	2	4.8	1
Personal potential	4.7	2	4.8	1
Decision-making skills	4.7	2	4.7	4
Independence	4.7	2	4.7	4
Sense of women's present	4.7	2	4.4	10
Assertiveness skills	4.6	7	4.5	8
Openness to new experiences	4.5	8	4.7	4
Creativity	4.4	9	4.4	10
Professional potential	4.4	9	4.6	7
Professional/technical skills	4.3	11	4.5	8
Discrimination coping skills	4.3	11	4.2	14
Personal role models	4.2	13	4.2	14
Risk-taking	4.2	13	4.1	16
Professional female role models	4.1	15	4.1	16
Feminist perspective	4.1	15	3.6	18
New career goals	4.0	17	4.3	13
Leadership skills	4.0	17	4.4	10
Sense of women's historical past	3.9	19	3.3	19
Professional male role models	3.0	20	3.3	19

Importance Scale: 5 = Extremely important
4 = Rather important
3 = Somewhat important
2 = Of little importance
1 = Of no importance

Table 11

QUALITY RATINGS OF EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES
Coeducational Institutions vs. Women's Instutitions

Attributes	Coed Institutions (n = 68)		Women's Institutions (n = 194)	
	Program	Traditional Program	Program	Traditional Program
Sense of women's present	4.1	2.7	3.8	3.7
Openness to new experiences	4.0	3.4	4.0	3.8
Independence	3.9	3.0	4.0	3.8
Self-confidence	3.9	3.0	3.9	3.7
Feminist perspective	3.9	2.3	3.5	3.3
Personal potential	3.9	3.3	3.9	3.9
Professional female role models	3.8	2.7	3.9	3.7
Personal role models	3.8	2.8	3.8	3.6
Communication skills	3.7	3.2	3.7	3.9
Professional potential	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.7
New career goals	3.6	3.1	3.9	3.8
Assertiveness skills	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.6
Discrimination coping skills	3.6	3.0	3.5	3.2
Risk-taking	3.6	2.5	3.5	3.4
Sense of women's historical past	3.6	2.4	3.5	3.3
Decision-making skills	3.5	3.1	3.6	3.6
Professional/technical skills	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.5
Creativity	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.5
Leadership skills	3.3	2.8	3.5	3.6
Professional male role models	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3

NOTE: All figures are means.
Quality Scale: 5 = Excellent
4 = Very Good
3 = Good
2 = Fair
1 = Poor

education. However, as indicated in table 11, the mean quality scores of the traditional educational experiences in coeducational and women's colleges vary substantially on the items that relate to feminism, self-confidence, leadership, and risk-taking. In these instances, the single-sex colleges are rated more highly than the coeducational universities. On the remaining items, the scores are similar and denote experiences of "good" to "very good" in quality.

> ...unique programs for women may be even more important at coeducational schools....

While the research caveats are far too great for strong generalization, these data suggest some issues for future research. It would appear that special programs for women enhance the quality of education a female undergraduate at a coeducational university receives and may be even more crucial to her full development than similar programs at a women's college. If this is the case, the ramifications are extensive and greatly affect the funding and design of women's educational options. Before such a conclusion is accepted, more extensive research needs to be conducted in a variety of coeducational settings.

What Is the Impact of These Programs?

The previous points have described the specific outcomes or results that students attribute to their program experiences. In a more general way, they were also asked to assess and then compare the impact of their internship, women's studies class, or skills class with other educational experiences. The findings are expressed in tables 12 and 13.

Table 12

LEVEL OF IMPACT

Level of Impact	Internships (n=104)	Women's Studies (n=51)	Skills Classes (n=26)
Strong	61%	47%	39%
Some	30	41	58
Weak	6	3	---
None	2	8	4

Table 13

IMPACT COMPARED TO OTHER EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES

Comparison	Internships (n=104)	Women's Studies (n=51)	Skills Classes (n=26)
Lots more	66%	37%	27%
Some	18	35	58
Same	14	8	12
Less	2	20	4

It is clear that all three types of experiences have impact on undergraduates, although internships seem to have the most. Table 13 underscores this point dramatically. Sixty-six percent of the interns felt that that experience had "lots more" impact than any other educational experience they had had. Further, internships have more impact on students than either women's studies or skills classes. On the other hand, 28% of the women's studies students felt that the impact of that experience was no greater or even less than their other educational experiences. However, the majority of all students agreed that these unique programs do matter, for they seem to affect students in ways unlike any other previous course.

Explanations for these findings are tentative. Internships probably have the most impact because they are most unlike the typical educational experience. They are off-campus, involve doing rather than booking, and are not abstract, intellectual exercises. They offer the opportunity to apply the fruits of one's education and may be the first time a young woman feels competent in the "real world." The skills classes take place in an academic setting, but the process and content are generally new to students. Therefore, 85% of these students felt that these experiences had "some" to "lots more" impact than their other courses to date. While the majority of women's studies students found its impact to be more than other educational experiences, a larger percentage of this group rated their women's studies class as having the "same" or "less" impact (28% in women's studies compared to 16% in either internships or skills classes). This may be due to the fact that despite the new information gained in studying about women, the instructional process and setting are generally similar to other classes. Nonetheless, all three experiences were perceived as rather powerful for these women and exceeded the impact of traditional, typical classes.

Were These Women Satisfied With Their Experiences And How Could They Be Improved?

Satisfaction with the experience is a complementary question to the issue of impact. As table 14 notes, the overwhelming majority of all students were satisfied with both the content and process of each type of experience. However, the skills classes were generally given the highest satisfaction ratings in all four categories.

From these responses, some distinct differences between the program types are apparent. Relationships with faculty or program directors are satisfying across all programs. Satisfaction with the process of the experience (e.g., instructional modes) is highest in the internships and skills classes, while satisfaction with content is slightly higher in the women's studies classes. Student satisfaction with their personal development is obvious in all three programs, although the percentages of those who were "very satisfied" are notably higher in the internships and skills classes.

> ...these innovative processes breed greater personal satisfaction while traditional instructional processes lead to more satisfaction with content....

A summary conclusion is that innovative processes, such as the internships and skills classes, breed greater satisfaction with personal development, while traditional instructional modes foster greater satisfaction with traditional academic content. Although this is not the way it has to be, these were the differences that were found to exist in these program types.

Despite the strong satisfaction in all three programs, students indicated that each program could be improved. Table 15 juxtaposes students' expectations with their retrospective thoughts on what the programs could have offered.

Seemingly, students judged a program by its content and structure, not by their original reasons for enrolling in the program. In other words, they chose a program thinking one thing would happen, but by the end of the program, they didn't seem to mind if it didn't happen. This was true in all three programs. Such a pragmatic stance is confusing, for although the reasons for enrolling in a program varied with the option, the suggested improvements or additions were the same for each program. One wonders if students know how to judge these experiences. An exception was women's studies, where students came for cognitive reasons and then gained in their cognitive development. However, this may be because the format of women's studies is more like other university classes and therefore students know what to expect and how to measure the outcomes of the course.

Table 14

SATISFACTION RATINGS

How Satisfied Were You With.....?
(Percentage of Responses)

Relationship with Instructor or Program Director	Internships (n=128)	Women's Studies (n=82)	Skills Classes (n=53)
Very satisfied	44%	45%	49%
Satisfied	38	45	42
Dissatisfied	12	9	9
Very dissatisfied	6	1	0

Process of the Educational Experience	Internships	Women's Studies	Skills Classes
Very satisfied	43%	34%	47%
Satisfied	41	45	45
Dissatisfied	8	17	8
Very dissatisfied	8	5	0

Academic Content	Internships	Women's Studies	Skills Classes
Very satisfied	55%	60%	52%
Satisfied	40	34	33
Dissatisfied	5	6	14
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0

Personal Development	Internships	Women's Studies	Skills Classes
Very satisfied	63%	39%	55%
Satisfied	33	54	39
Dissatisfied	3	8	6
Very dissatisfied	1	0	2

Table 15

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' INITIAL EXPECTATIONS WITH PROGRAM REALITIES

Evaluation	Internships (n = 128)	Women's Studies (n = 83)	Skills Classes (n = 55)
Most frequently mentioned expectation	69% career exposure	66% academic content	42% new skills
Most significant program experience	57% skills learned	64% cognitive growth	45% affective growth 44% skills learned
Most frequently mentioned suggestion for improvement	70% program structure	40% program structure 30% personnel	49% class structure 31% content
Most frequently suggested addition to program	31% academic content	44% academic content	credit classes: 55% academic content non-credit classes: 23% academic content 23% program structure

Students were pleased with their experiences (see table 14) even if the results did not necessarily match their expectations. Perhaps students do not know how to judge nontraditional environments such as an internship or assertiveness training class. Or, their initial expectations may have been so low and/or the outcomes so positive, that the differences between expectations and reality were hardly disappointing. Some support is given to this last point by student responses to interview questions that asked if they had experienced any surprises or unexpected outcomes while enrolled in the internship, women's studies class, or skills class. More than 75% of each group of students replied yes, positive unexpected outcomes occurred. Examples included new information, new professional contacts, new friends and support, or more personal growth than they had imagined was possible. Again, the power of these experiences is obvious, for they achieve results that surpass the initial expectations of the students.

The faculty/program directors were also asked for suggested improvements to their programs. Table 16 contrasts the major improvements desired by students and faculty.

Table 16

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

Program	Major Improvement
Internships:	
Students (n = 120)	70% program structure
Faculty (n = 22)	46% program structure
	46% program administration
Women's Studies:	
Students (n = 80)	40% program structure
	30% program personnel
Faculty (n = 8)	63% administrative processes
	38% academic content
Skills Classes:	
Students (n = 50)	49% program structure
	31% academic content
Faculty (n = 7)	50% program structure
	50% academic content

Internship and skills class students and faculty agree that structural changes are the most important kind of improvement to make. In an internship, a structural change might involve better

communication between director and intern supervisor or a longer period of time spent on-the-job. Similar changes in a skills class could be tighter discussion formats or more class meetings.

Women's studies students and faculty evidence some disagreement about course improvements, probably reflective of their different perspectives. Students felt structural and personnel changes were most important, while faculty saw administrative issues and content as the major foci of improvements. In other words, students want to better their classroom experiences, but faculty are concerned with larger issues, such as course accreditation, departmental course evaluations, and the like, in addition to basic content questions.

It would seem that women's studies faculty experience political pressures or administrative battles more intensely than the faculty in the other two programs. Table 17 checks this hypothesis by comparing the sources of support felt by the various groups of faculty. Internal males and females were defined as colleagues within one's own institution, while external males and females were professional peers outside of one's institution.

These data are revealing. Women's studies faculty feel the least amount of support, when compared to either of the other two groups. Further, their greatest amount of support is derived from their female colleagues outside their school. Perhaps this is attributable to the political nature of women's studies, which may be threatening to all men, as well as women who lack feminist perspectives. Consequently, women's studies faculty may feel as though others see them as "rebels." Their support then comes from other "rebels" in the larger network of women's studies faculty around the country.

The implications of these data relate to improvements for a women's studies class. If faculty concerns about administrative processes could be corrected, as noted in table 16, they feel that their women's studies class would benefit. For example, if less faculty time was spent convincing administrators that a women's studies class was worthy of credit or that it should be applicable to tenure decisions, more time could then be spent improving program structure or content. And if these faculty felt more support from their internal colleagues, one would expect that some of the issues of administrative communication and decision making would be improved. As it stands, women's studies faculty seem to feel alone within their institutions.

> ...women's studies faculty feel somewhat alone within their institutions....

Do These Experiences Relate To Students' Future Roles?

Another reason that students may have found these experiences so unexpectedly positive relates to the correlation between

Table 17

PEER APPROVAL

Constituency	Internships		Women's Studies		Skills Classes	
	Within Institution	Outside Institution	Within Institution	Outside Institution	Within Institution	Outside Institution
Professional male peers	4.2	4.6	2.6	3.0	3.8	4.0
Professional female peers	4.4	4.7	3.8	4.2	5.0	4.8

Note: Figures are means.

Support Scale: 1 = Strong peer disapproval
2 = Some peer disapproval
3 = No perceived approval or disapproval
4 = Some peer approval
5 = Strong peer approval

the program outcomes and the future roles these women expect. Students were asked to name the roles that they saw themselves assuming in the future and also to list the skills and attitudes they felt would lead to success in those roles. They could mention as many or as few roles and skills as they cared to; the question was completely open. Tables 18 and 19 summarize their responses.

Table 18

MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED ROLES

Role	Internships (n=124)	Women's Studies (n=81)	Skills Classes (n=52)
Family*	84%	69%	77%
Career - general	53	44	48
Career - helping	33	35	36
Career - self-employment	9	10	2
Citizen	19	12	15
Student	9	16	21
Hobbies	18	15	19
Single	8	13	2

* Further analysis of family role data revealed that some women desired wife-only roles while others wanted wife-mother roles. The breakdown was:

Wife Roles	Internships	Women's Studies	Skills Classes
wife-only	23%	23%	19%
wife-mother	61	46	58

Additionally, women choosing wife-only roles were more committed to career roles.

Table 19

MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED SKILLS

Skill	Internships (n=124)	Women's Studies (n=81)	Skills Classes (n=52)
Self-confidence	72%	68%	73%
Interpersonal skills	70	61	63
Technical/Professional	74	56	33
Assertiveness	19	21	37
Communication	24	27	27
Creativity	9	7	20
Decision making	8	10	16
Risk taking	3	4	6
Leadership	4	8	10

The vast majority of these young women expect to assume family roles. Career roles are also desired by many, but to assume that the modern undergraduate has forsaken family responsibilities seems to be unfounded.

The kinds of skills and attitudes that were mentioned are interesting because of what was and what was not listed. Self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and technical/professional skills were the three skills or attitudes mentioned most frequently by the women in all three types of programs. Not surprisingly, the intern group underscored technical/professional skills much more often than the other two groups (74% versus 56% or 33%). Perhaps an experiential encounter in the professional world stresses the importance and increases the knowledge of professional/technical skills.

The impact of an internship becomes more clear. Interns expected to gain career exposure. A part of this exposure was observing the "real world," but even more specifically, the importance of technical and professional skills became apparent to them. These skills included critical analysis, logical thinking, etc., as well as some job-specific expertise. It would appear that women's studies or skills classes do not foster the same appreciation for professional/technical skills, probably because these programs do not desire or expect to deal with such points. Nonetheless, professional roles and skills are important to all of these students, but internships seem to serve these needs better than the other types of programs.

It is somewhat disconcerting to see the low percentage accorded to creativity, risk taking, and leadership. Although students had just completed the Experience Inventory as part of the interview (see Appendix), and subsequently gave such skills high ratings of importance, they did not seem to connect the belief in these skills to the actual utility these skills will have in their future lives. Do the scores in table 19 represent oversight or real feelings that risk taking, leadership, and creativity are unrelated to the future roles of these women? Future research should probe this point to understand better the role that higher education could play in developing these qualities in women. Additional data showed that approximately 75% of each group of women said their major future challenge is tied to their career, and therefore, risk taking, leadership, and creativity would seem to be intricately related to the lives of these students. It is surprising that these undergraduates have not drawn that conclusion.

Do Students Feel Discrimination And How Can Colleges Respond?

More general interview questions were also asked. One focused on students' perceptions of the discrimination they have experienced in the course of their education. Table 20

contrasts the responses by program type and table 21 constrasts those of coeducational and single-sex schools.

Table 20

FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION BY PROGRAM TYPE

Perception	Internships (n = 128)	Women's Studies (n = 83)	Skills Classes (n = 55)
Have experienced discrimination	23%	38%	40%
Have not experienced discrimination	77	62	60

Table 21

FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Perception	Coeducational Colleges (n = 72)	Women's Colleges (n = 128)
Have experienced discrimination	43%	27%
Have not experienced discrimination	57	73

More women in the skills and women's studies classes have or feel they have experienced discrimination than have interns.* Given that these two program types foster higher degrees of feminism than internships, it could well be that they also result in increased sensitivities to acts of discrimination. Further, more coed students are aware of or have experienced discrimination than women at single-sex schools. These data do not offer reasons for this difference. It may have to do with the educational backgrounds of these groups, or the likelihood that discrimination may be a part of the educational experience at a coeducational institution, or heightened feminist awareness of discrimination by coeds. New data are needed to pinpoint the roots of these feelings.

*Students provided their own definitions of discrimination, which ranged from subtle to overt bias from others.

Although coed students are more likely to have known discrimination, it is interesting that they suggest fewer improvements to their college as a school for women. Tables 22 and 23 highlight the responses from five perspectives.

Table 22

IMPROVEMENTS AS A SCHOOL FOR WOMEN BY PROGRAM TYPE

Student Suggested Improvements	Internships (n = 128)	Women's Studies (n = 83)	Skills Classes (n = 55)
Yes, my college could be improved as a place for women.	80%	61%	69%
How could it be improved:			
structure/staff	36	26	35
academics	40	46	32
nonacademics	18	20	36
other*	47	44	30

*Examples include: more commitment to women's viewpoints, increased feminist awareness, less paternalism.

The similarities and differences between the groups are interesting. Interns seem to desire the most change in their schools, with greatest emphasis on improving the structure, staffing, and attitudes of their schools. Between the programs, the categories of improvements are similar. Nonacademic improvements such as workshops and support services were usually mentioned least. Academics and attitudes (or the "other" category) were the most popular avenues for improvement.

Table 23 highlights the surprising difference between coed and single-sex schools. Students at single-sex colleges appear more desirous of improvements than coed students. For coeds, the least priority seems to be structural or staffing changes, while nonacademic improvements were mentioned least by the women at single-sex colleges. Both groups agree that academic and attitudinal changes are the most important. New courses, less paternalism in college policy, and more commitment to feminist views by students, faculty, and administrators are examples of the types of changes that all students might endorse. Academic improvements, such as curricular revisions or the addition of new faculty, may take substantial time and money to change curriculum or hire new faculty. However, decreased paternalism

and other attitudinal changes could be brought about with less expense if schools committed themselves to these ends. Perhaps, a public or private discussion of such attitudes is all that is needed to overcome these attitudinal obstacles. Future research could detect other possible improvements.

Table 23

IMPROVEMENTS AS A SCHOOL FOR WOMEN BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Student Suggested Improvements	Coeducational Colleges (n = 72)	Women's Colleges (n = 128)
Yes, my college could be improved as a place for women.	57%	76%
How could it be improved:		
structure/staff	19	35
academics	41	40
nonacademics	36	18
other*	43	48

* Examples include: more commitment to women's viewpoints, increased feminist awareness, less paternalism.

Do Faculty Overestimate Program Outcomes?

Moving from student to faculty evaluations of these experiences, table 24 contrasts faculty and student ratings of whether or not each program type provided the opportunity to develop the attributes included in the Experience Inventory.

Generally, all faculty seem to overestimate the extent to which leadership skills and risk taking are provided in their programs. Specifically, women's studies faculty seem to feel that more skills or behavioral outcomes are provided than do their students, while the faculty of noncredit skills classes underestimate the number of skills that are taught. The highest match between student and faculty ratings are found in the skills classes offered for credit.

Table 24

OPPORTUNITIES TO DEVELOP ATTRIBUTES
Faculty vs. Students

Percentage of Yes Responses

Attribute	Internships		Women's Studies		Skills Classes	
	Faculty (n=21)	Students (n=120)	Faculty (n=13)	Students (n=80)	Faculty (n=7)	Students (n=50)
Openness to new experiences	100%	94%	91%	85%	100%	88%
Self-confidence	100	91	92	89	100	96
Communication skills	100	91	83	76	84	90
Professional potential	100	90	92	67	100	88
Independence	100	89	92	77	100	90
Personal potential	100	88	91	85	100	96
Sense of women's present	100	87	100	99	100	96
Professional female role models	100	87	100	86	100	86
Personal role models	100	83	92	81	100	88
Leadership skills	100	75	85	65	84	78
Assertiveness skills	95	87	92	78	84	98
Professional/technical skills	95	87	40	39	70	50
Decision making skills	95	81	75	64	100	94
Creativity	95	77	75	65	70	80
Discrimination coping skills	95	56	85	78	84	82
Risk-taking	85	65	92	67	100	84
New career goals	80	85	25	61	70	76
Feminist perspective	71	61	92	89	84	92
Professional male role models	40	76	58	38	56	30
Sense of women's historical past	25	19	100	92	70	52

The implications of these data deserve discussion. If faculty overestimate the outcomes of these programs, they may oversell and subsequently disappoint students. In addition, if faculty think their courses result in certain outcomes, and they want to be sure that students experience these outcomes, then pedagogical techniques should be refined to insure that such results are produced. It appears that only classes that specially focus on behavior will result in behavioral outcomes.

...faculty may overestimate the outcomes for students....

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This report has documented the impact, outcomes, and implications that three types of educational options have for undergraduate women. The importance of all three programs cannot be overplayed, for each type helps students to develop new ideas and/or new skills that are important to both the education and future lives of these women. Without these educational options, many of these qualities would never be experienced.

The major points from this research are:

1. Students choose the program that logically suits their needs. Interns seek career exposure, women's studies students desire new ideas about women and their contributions to society, and students in skills classes want new skills.

2. Each type of program accomplishes exactly what it set as its major goal, but also contributes more. Internships not only give career exposure but also foster independence , self-confidence, and greater ideas of one's personal potential. Women's studies classes not only contribute to feminist perspectives but also to self-esteem, independence, and openness. Skills classes teach assertiveness and communication skills, as well as develop self-confidence, independence, and a sense of women's present.

3. These types of programs may be even more important in coeducational settings for enhancing women's full development.*

4. For the majority of students, the three programs have more impact on students than their other educational experiences.

5. Satisfaction within each program was high, although innovative processes fostered greater satisfaction with one's personal development while traditional processes produced higher satisfaction with academic content.

---

*Further research in coeducational institutions is recommended to test whether this suggestion is generally applicable.

6. These programs teach the skills and attitudes that students expect to need for their future roles.

7. More students at coeducational schools felt they had experienced discrimination than students at single-sex colleges. However, more students at women's colleges felt their schools needed to improve their responses to women's needs.

8. Faculty slightly overestimate the outcomes of each program.

With these points in mind, some general recommendations can be made to others who may want to duplicate or improve programs similar to these internships, women's studies, and skills classes. Several brief guidelines have been created to help readers apply these findings to their own situations. Whether the reader's purpose is to design new programs for women or improve current offerings, the following suggestions may enhance the quality of the endeavor:

1. In all programs, students experience what they are lead to expect. The various program types accomplished their major goals, but also led to important outcomes that were not initially stated to students. Perhaps more women would desire or use these nontraditional programs if multiple program outcomes were explicit. In sum, know your program well and relate <u>all</u> its benefits clearly.

2. Despite the expanded horizons that new developmental programs have established for women, only small numbers of students relate their future roles to skills in risk taking, leadership, etc. Therefore, extra resources may be required to develop nontraditionally feminine qualities such as risk taking, leadership, and decision-making skills in women. Resources could be used both to raise female awareness that such skills are crucial to their futures and to teach or support student growth in these ways.

3. The ideal program for women should probably have aspects of an internship, a women's studies course, and skills development activities. Each type of program accomplishes distinct but equally important outcomes. However, if a total program is not possible, choose the activity that matches the primary goals.

   For example, if the point is to affect career goals, give students a good internship. This requires a committed, accessible faculty director(s) and intern supervisors who can carefully structure assignments to achieve a good balance between autonomy and instruction for the student.

   If one wants to expand feminist perspectives and intellectual concepts about what women can achieve, offer women's studies. To maximize the effects of this experience, the faculty must be able to manage challenging discussions that have the potential to threaten some women.

If the chosen goal is the promotion of affective growth and interpersonal skills, such as risk taking, create a course that works with behavior, not just ideas. Innovative teaching structures are particularly necessary to accomplish this end.

The issues raised for future research are many. An expanded sample of coeducational schools would clarify many of the points raised about the differences between single-sex and coed colleges. Further, a similar study of male undergraduates would add insight to the low ratings of skills such as risk taking and leadership. Perhaps a majority of all undergraduates under twenty-two years of age would not link these qualities to their future roles. Finally, a longitudinal study of these women would contribute to a better understanding of the ultimate impact of these types of programs. At this point, the major conclusion of Project WELD is that each of these programs makes an important and immediate contribution to the education of young women. Time will record the eventual usefulness of each experience for these women.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banner, Lois. Women in the College Curriculum: A Preliminary Report on the Princeton Project on Women in the College Curriculum. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1977.

Cross, Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Dempsey, Ann. A Humanist Looks at Women's Studies and the Implications of Such Programs for the Comprehensive Community College. Grant Number F-72-257 National Endowment for the Humanities, 1973.

Folger, J., Astin, H., and Bayer, A. Human Resources and Higher Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Hansot, Elizabeth. In New Colleges for New Learners. Edited by Laurence Hall and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Horner, Matina. "Toward an Understanding of Achievement Related Conflicts in Women," Journal of Social Issues, 1972.

Howe, Florence. Seven Years Later: Women's Studies Programs in 1976. For the Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. In press.

Newcombe, Theodore. Personality and Social Change. New York: Dryden, 1943.

Tidball, M. Elizabeth. "Perspective on Women and Affirmative Action." Educational Record, 1973; "On Men and Research: The Dominant Themes in American Higher Education Include Neither Teaching Nor Women," The Journal of Higher Education 47, no. 4, 1976.

Wilson, Kenneth. "Today's Women Students: New Outlooks, Options," Findings 1, no. 4, 1974.

Zinberg, Dorothy. In Women and Success. Edited by Ruth Kundsin. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1973.

APPENDIX

WELD DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Appendix A -- Student-Alumni Interview
Appendix B -- Strengths and Weaknesses Form
Appendix C -- Experience Inventory
Appendix D -- Faculty-Administrator Interview
Appendix E -- Client-Employer Interview
Appendix F -- Institutional Feedback Sheet

APPENDIX A

STUDENT-ALUMNI INTERVIEW

WELD STUDENT/ALUM INTERVIEW

NAME_____ CLASS_____
INSTITUTION_____
PROGRAM TITLE_____
DATE_____

I am a member of a team reviewing different types of educational programs for women. In our visit to _____ we are talking to the students, administrators, clients and faculty involved in several different programs. I will be asking you questions that are factual as well as solicitous of your personal opinions. Your responses are confidential and no individual names will ever be used in the reporting of this information. We hope that you will speak freely and frankly. This interview will take approximately one hour--is that your expectation?

I. Program Entry

1. To begin, what attracted you to this school?

2. Why did you decide to become involved in _____ program?

3. Thinking about the experiences you had in _____ program, which ones stand out as the most important or significant for you? And why?

4. How have these experiences related to your other classes here? Do the learnings (content or skills) support your other educational experiences? How?

II. Program Evaluation

5. I'd like to focus on some very specific educational outcomes that your involvement in Program X may have given you. To do this, could you please complete the following form? (Experience Inventory)

6. [By each rating of "excellent"] Specifically what events, people or ideas made (item X) an excellent one for you?

7. This question has two parts. First, what are the major roles you see for yourself in the future, and second, which skills, attitudes, or ideas seem most important for your chosen roles? (They may include, but not be limited to, those on the Inventory.)

8. Did you experience any surprises or unexpected outcomes (e.g., contacts, skills, awarenesses) from Program X?

9. Thinking back, what were the major strengths and weaknesses of the program (complete form)?

10. How could program X's merit be improved?

11. Would most of your peers agree with your suggestions for improvement?
___Yes ___No Differences:

III. Satisfaction with Program

12. Using this card (give Satisfaction Scale, 1-4), I'd like to ask you some questions about your satisfaction with various parts of this program. First, how satisfied are/were you with your relationship(s) with the instructor(s) in Program X? Scale: 1-4/Why?

1 = Very Satisfied
2 = Somewhat Satisfied
3 = Dissatisfied
4 = Very Dissatisfied

13. How satisfied are/were you with the process of your educational experience (class discussion, etc.) in Program X? Scale: 1-4/Why?

14. How satisfied are/were you with the experiential aspect of Program X (internship, etc.)? Scale: 1-4/Why? With the client relationship? Scale: 1-4/Why?

15. How satisfied are/were you with the academic or traditionally educational aspect of Program X? Scale: 1-4/Why?

16. How satisfied were/are you with your personal development or changes as a result of your involvement in Program X? Scale: 1-4/Why?

16. (A) How much impact did this class/experience have on you? Scale 1-4. 1 = Strong; 2 = Some; 3 = Weak; 4= None.

16. (B) Did it have more impact on you than other educational experiences you have had? Scale 1-4. 1 = Lots more; 2 = Some; 3 = Same; 4 = Less.

IV. General Overview

17. Reflecting on your experience, is there something Program X did not provide that you wish it had? (What and Why?)

18. How could your college be improved as a school for women?

19. Do you feel an identity with this school now? _____Yes _____No
Do you expect that identity to ____increase, ____decrease, or _____remain the same 10 years from now? Why?

20. Thus far in your education, have you encountered any discrimination? ____ Yes ____No If Yes, describe. Have you felt satisfied with the way you coped with it? ____Yes ____No

21. Thinking about the future, what are the two to three greatest challenges your school faces?

22. What are the two to three greatest challenges that you face?

23. Do you think male students should have an experience like yours in Program X? ____Yes ____No Why?

24. Other comments or questions?

Our deep thanks for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FORM

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAM EXPERIENCE

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Weaknesses

1.

2.

3.

APPENDIX C

EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

EXPERIENCE INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a learning inventory of skills and qualities which students may or may not gain as participants in your program. This form seeks your assessment of whether opportunities exist for the development of these skills and qualities and your assessment of the quality of student experience. If you can think of additional skills or qualities, please add them at the bottom of the inventory.

	Have the following been increased or affected by your experience in:	Yes	Quality*	No		Traditional Curriculum Yes	Quality*	No
IDEAS	Sense of women's historical past				. . .			
	Sense of women's present. .				. . .			
	Feminist perspective . . .				. . .			
	Professional female role models				. . .			
	Professional male role models				. . .			
	Personal role models . . .				. . .			
	New career goals.				. . .			
SKILLS	Assertiveness skills . . .				. . .			
	Leadership skills				. . .			
	Communication skills . . .				. . .			
	Decision-making skills . .				. . .			
	Professional/technical skills				. . .			
	Discrimination coping skills				. . .			
ATTITUDES	Your self-confidence . . .				. . .			
	Your independence				. . .			
	Your risk-taking				. . .			
	Your openness to new experiences				. . .			
	Your creativity				. . .			
	Your personal potential . .				. . .			
	Your professional potential				. . .			
	Other				. . .			
	Other				. . .			

*QUALITY SCALE: 5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 3 = Good 2 = Fair 1 = Poor 0 = Not applicable

	How important is each of these qualities to you?	Personal Opinion of the Importance of Each:*
IDEAS	Sense of women's historical past	
	Sense of women's present. .	
	Feminist perspective . . .	
	Professional female role models	
	Professional male role models	
	Personal role models . . .	
	New career goals	
SKILLS	Assertiveness skills . . .	
	Leadership skills	
	Communication skills . . .	
	Decision-making skills . .	
	Professional/technical skills	
	Discrimination coping skills	
ATTITUDES	Your self-confidence . . .	
	Your independence	
	Your risk-taking	
	Your openness to new experiences	
	Your creativity	
	Your personal potential . .	
	Your professional potential	
	Other	
	Other	

*IMPORTANCE SCALE: 5 = Extremely Important
4 = Rather Important
3 = Somewhat Important
2 = Of Little Importance
1 = Of No Importance

APPENDIX D

FACULTY-ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW

WELD FACULTY/ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW

NAME_____/RANK_____
INSTITUTION_____
PROGRAM TITLE_____
DATE_____

I am a member of a team reviewing different types of educational programs for women. In our visit to _____ we are talking to the students, administrators, clients and faculty involved in several different programs. I will be asking you questions that are factual as well as solicitous of your personal opinions. Your responses are confidential and no individual names will ever be used in the reporting of this information. We hope that you will speak freely and frankly. This interview will take approximately one-hour--is that your expectation?

I. Task Description

1. At the specific level, what are your chief responsibilities with regard to Program X?

2. From your perspective, what were the basic objectives for the establishment of Program X?

3. Is there a good fit between the goals of Program X and the goals of this institution? ___Yes ___No Describe the differences.

4. What are the most important skills or attitudes your program offers to women?

5. Specifically, could you, on this list of possible outcomes, rate them in accordance with your experience in Program X? [Experience Inventory]

6. For those outcomes which you rated excellent, could you describe the aspect(s) of Program X that achieve(s) this?

II. Role Description

7. We are interested in the demands and rewards that your participation in Program X gives you.

   A. To begin, what are the personal benefits that you receive from Program X?

   B. What are the personal costs that you pay for your involvement in Program X?

8. From a professional viewpoint, what are the major benefits that you receive from Program X?

   -What are the professional costs that you pay for your involvement in Program X?

9. Have you received or witnessed any unexpected outcomes from Program X?

10. What are the most crucial skills or attitudes one (faculty or administrator) needs to function well in your role in Program X?

11. What single skill or ability do you wish you could improve to make you more effective in Program X?

12. Using the following scale, please record a number in each box that reflects the nature of peer approval that you receive for your involvement in Program X.

Scale:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strong Peer Disapproval	Some Peer Disapproval	No Perceived Approval or Disapproval	Some Peer Approval	Strong Peer Approval

	Professional Male Peers	Professional Female Peers
Within Institution		
Outside Institution		

13. Within your institution, are you adequately rewarded your involvement in Program X? ___Yes ___No How?/How could it?

14. Is there a difference between the personal and the professional rewards you receive? ___Yes ___No Describe.

15. What forces argue for and against your support of and/or involvement in Program X?

16. What tips would you pass on to those who might want to duplicate or adapt Program X?

17. From your perspective, what are the most important characteristics of Program X that make it relevant to the needs of women today? Why?

18. What changes would you like to see in your role vis a vis Program X? Why?

III. Summary and General Reflection

19. Do you feel that Program X should be expanded (credits, students, faculty, resources) or cut? Why?

20. What are the two to three major challenges Program X faces in the near future?

21. From your perspective, what are Program X's major strengths and weaknesses? (Sheet)

22. How could Program X's merits be improved?

23. Final questions and comments.

APPENDIX E

CLIENT-EMPLOYER INTERVIEW

WELD CLIENT/EMPLOYER INTERVIEW

NAME_____
INSTITUTION/BUSINESS_____
POSITION _____
DATE_____
RE: PROGRAM AT _____

I am a member of a team reviewing different types of educational programs for women. In our visit to _____, we are talking to students, administrators, clients, and faculty involved in several interesting programs. I will be asking you questions that relate to your role as (an employer/student supervisor/client) of students from Program X at _____ _____. Some questions ask for facts about your experience with Program X, while others solicit your personal opinions. Your responses are confidential and no individual names will ever be used in the reporting of this information. We hope that you will speak freely and frankly. This interview will take approximately one hour--is that your expectation?

I. Program Involvement

1. Let's begin with your reasons for becoming involved in Program X. Why did you choose to be a part of the program?

2. What are the major benefits for you? For the student?

3. What are the most noticeable gaps between a student's academic preparation and the demands of the job?

4. Are there any tasks you would not assign a student? ___Yes ___No
Why?

5. Does the semester time frame fit your needs? ___Yes ___No? Problems:

6. How would you describe/rate the communication between you and program X? (Use card with Scale: 1-4). Problems:

II. Program Assessment

7. In considering candidates for job openings, would a person with an experience in Program X be preferred? ___Yes ___No Why?

8. As a group, do women from Program X have any distinguishing characteristics? ___Yes ___No If yes, what? And to what do you attribute this?

9. Have there been any unexpected outcomes for you due to your involvement with Program X?

10. From your perspective, what are the major strengths and weaknesses in Program X? (Sheet)

11. Other comments.

APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONAL FEEDBACK SHEET

Project WELD Women's Education: Learning and Doing

Please respond to the following questions and feel free to expand your answers on additional paper. Thank you.

Feedback Sheet

1. How interesting is this information to you?

_____Very interesting _____Somewhat interesting _____Not interesting

Why?

2. How relevant is this information of your future programmatic/administrative decisions?

_____Very relevant _____Somewhat relevant _____Not relevant

Why?

3. Did this information do more than confirm your intuitions about your programs?

_____Yes _____No

4. Did this information increase your understanding of the programs?

_____Yes _____No

Why?

5. Please list items from the enclosed interview questionnaire for which you desire further analysis.

Feedback Sheet (2)

6. Please state any other questions from the questionnaires, this report, or other sources which you would like to see in our second communication:

7. Please prioritize the following options for the mode of the second report: 1 = 1st choice, 2 = 2nd choice, etc.

_____ No further report desired

_____ Extended written report on this school (as Questions 5 and 6)

_____ Final report to FIPSE comparing the three program types across the eight settings

_____ Oral presentation/discussion before a limited audience (i.e., two or three decision-makers at your school)

_____ Workshop or conference with other schools in this study to discuss mutual issues

_____ Some combination of the above (please describe):

_____ Other (please describe):

8. FERA may only be able to do one of the above: please circle the single item listed in Question #7 that you feel is most important to you.

9. Other comments on this working paper or the next report: